DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 374 HE 021 047

AUTHOR McShane, Kevin; Douzenis, Cordelia
TITLE Evaluation and Reward: Is Research the Only Way?
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Mobile, AL, November 11-13, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Evaluation Criteria; *Faculty Evaluation; *Faculty Publishing; Higher Education; Promotion (Occupational); Publish or Perish Issue; Research; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Promotion; Teaching Skills; Teaching Styles; Tenure; Tenured Faculty

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to determine faculty attitudes about research, teaching and community service as criteria for evaluating college faculty, and about the effects that the interaction of these three criteria have on the profession of higher education. Surveys were mailed to 230 randomly selected faculty members, and 113 responses were received. The characteristics of the respondents were analyzed: 29% were female and 71% male; median age was 44; 73.9% had doctoral degrees; and 52.7% were tenured. Results of the survey included the following: (1) 63.5% of the males rated research and publication highly as criteria, compared to only 33.3% of the females; (2) more of the younger faculty (71%) were interested in a university-sponsored personal development program to improve teaching style than were older faculty (47.1%); (3) those with doctoral degrees assigned a higher level of priority to research than those with master's degrees; and (4) most tenured faculty felt that the administration assigned a low priority to classroom teaching, while nontenured faculty were almost equally divided on that point. Two tables summarize the survey responses. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290374

Evaluation and Reward: Is Research the Only Way

Kevin McShane
Cordelia Douzenis

Memphis State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kevin McShane

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mid-South Educational Research Association Annual Meeting

Mobile, Alabama

November, 1987

HE 021 047

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Most university handbooks state that faculty are evaluated on three areas -- teaching, community service, and research. Unfortunately, many administrations evaluate primarily on quality of research and number of professional publications. Recognizing that some faculty excel in teaching and community service, some question the fairness of basing one's evaluation and rewards almost solely on the amount of research activity that he or she is involved in.

Current higher education research supports the fact that many of today's faculty members are dissatisfied with their current positions because of the methods of evaluation and reward. This paper presents faculty attitudes about research, teaching, and community service and also about the effects that the interaction of these three aspects of evaluation have on the profession of higher education. It also offers faculty opinions on the tenure system and on alternative methods of evaluation.

Research and Teaching

Research, according to Creswell (1986), is a "multidimensional concept that may differ for individuals gathering performance information for promotion and tenure, for programs and departments under review for quality, and for institutions preparing college profiles for public officials" (p.87). It can create prestige and additional funds for a university or its individual departments, develop power and irreplaceability for faculty research specialists, and heighten the public's appreciation of higher education scholarship (DeYoung, 1985, Kasten, 1984).

Gonzalez (1986) states that many factors can effect the quality of faculty research including the size of teaching loads, the adequacy of the library, and the availability of laboratories, equipment and research assistants. A major factor affecting

whether or not research will be undertaken is funding. Kasten (1984) reminds the readers of the financial base of the university in the following statements:

> "Neither departments nor universities can be oriented entirely to professional groups. Economic allocations to universities are based predominantly on students, not research productivity....Although a faculty member can fail to do research (at least over a short period of time) without being censured by colleagues and clients, the same cannot be said for teaching." (p. 512)

Although Kasten (1984) indicates that research is contingent upon teaching activities, the emphasis on research activities by many universities has decreased the amount of time a faculty member can devote to teaching. According to Dill (1986) "the majority of faculty in research universities teach less than nine hours, report more time in research than in teaching, and engage more in research and graduate training than in undergraduate training" (p. 7).

Faculty (DeYoung, 1985) are also encouraged by their departments to be visible; however, high visibility cannot be attained by remaining in the classroom. Often career advancement and success are dependent upon the number of professional meetings attended and the number of publications accepted. DeYoung writes that "the major effort expended by academics within their professional communities is political rather than productive in nature" (p.420). Knowledge that their tenure status or salary level could be affected by their amount of research participation has become a strong motivator for many faculty members.

In the literature there are probably as many articles which state research negatively effects teaching as there against this proposition. Howard Bowen states, "Not only are the three factions of education, research, and public service carried on jointly; they are often mutually supportive. Similarly, research and public service may be enhanced when they are combined with instruction" (Webster, 1985, p. 60). Webster points out that although many academicians often agree with Bowen's statement, several empirical studies contradict this notion.

Comparing research in two decades, Webster (1985) managed to find ten empirical studies on the relationship between research productivity and teaching effectiveness. All of the studies concluded that little or no positive relationship existed between research productivity and teaching effectiveness. In a 1981 article, Webster reported that Stanley Michalak and Robert Friedrich concluded, after a five year study, that "the overall impression conveyed by the data is that research and teaching have something to do with each other, but not very much" (p. 62). In 1983, the same two authors reported, "most of the rationales supporting the idea that engaging in research fosters good teaching are invalid" (p.62). Webster states that some faculty researchers support the belief that research enhances teaching (although empirical evidence suggests otherwise) in order to justify the amount of time they devote to their research activities.

In support of research activities, Gonzalez (1986) argues that they are "the primary measure of the liveliness of a professor's mind and the test of how up-to-date one is" (p. 8). However, she does emphasize that research should not be forced upon faculty members as their only avenue for evaluation or reward. She states that "basic research usually does not thrive when faced with deadlines, pressure to answer specific questions, or too much publicity" (p. 9).

Service

Profession-related public service is that service which requires the specialized education and experience that qualifies a person to be a faculty member. Some of the rewards currently offered include:

- Giving faculty members release time from the performance of some of their regular duties
- Monetary payment to faculty members comparable to payment to an outside consultant
- In-kind assistance to faculty members, such as secretarial or graduate assistant support
- Awards for outstanding professional service

Florestano and Hambrick (1984) state that some university

environments do not reward public service and that the lack of reward reduces the development of university outreach programs. They offer a Faculty Performance Matrix with nine performance cells to aid in better judgement of public service. "The matrix offers clearer distinctions, acknowledges the value of different pursuits, allows faculty to choose from more areas, and it allows the highlighting of professional work which might be ignored" (p. 19).

Dill (1986) writes that in a few departments, service is seen as being as important as research. Service in these departments often involves making contacts with people who are useful to the department and its students, or it is an activity that will enhance the department's reputation. However, Gonzalez (1986) feels that service is merely "redundant and more a matter of window-dressing for a critical public than a meaningful category for evaluation" (p. 8).

Evaluation

Methods of evaluation can vary from institution to institution. Salomone and Vorhies (1985) write of an evaluation program developed at Ohio University - Chillicothe, a small, community-oriented teaching institution. Their program was developed from a behavioral perspective. They solicited input from their faculty members since the university "wanted to design and implement a system that would be generated by those it would judge, and that would be subject to an evolutionary process controlled by those whom it most affected" (p. 45). The program is aligned with the interests of the university, yet it is still responsive to the personal strengths and weaknesses of the faculty.

DeYoung (1985) supports the above system. He writes "a methodologically efficient scheme for analyzing faculty productivity would go a long way toward helping administrators cut through the ambiguity of academic scholarship" (p. 419). An effort should be made to bring all the parties together to negotiate a reasonable system for reward. According to Perlberg (1983), the lack of an adequate reward system "contributes to the low status of

teaching in the university" (p. 651). This inadequacy also leaves many faculty members unmotivated about classroom teaching as well as other aspects of their jobs.

One method of evaluating faculty members has been student evaluations. According to Dixon and Yarbrough (1986), the reliability of student evaluations is typically high; however, it is very difficult to assess the validity of these instruments. They state that "extreme caution should be exercised when using such results as the basis for modifying instruction, and particular care should be taken when using them for promotion and tenure decisions" (p. 33).

However, in a McGill University study (Donald, 1984), student ratings were found to be a dependable measure of teaching effectiveness. Donald also found that the correlations between student ratings and student's expected grade was not very high. March (Dixon and Yarbrough, 1986) has discovered that substantial agreement exists between faculty self-ratings and student's evaluations. Dixon and Yarbrough suggest that high ratings from students reflect a positive learning experience and that enough evidence exists to support continued use of student evaluation forms.

Alternative methods that some universities have incorporated into their evaluation system include videotaping of classroom teaching skills and faculty development programs. Videotaping a faculty member's classroom presentation really brings to attention one's personal appearance and any gestures or expressions that might be distracting to the students. Tribe and Fletcher (1984) found that having a videotape in the classroom produced only little change in the teacher's usual presentation. However, students mentioned that the teacher was often better prepared and proceeded at a slower pace. Only a few became nervous in the presence of the camera.

Videotaped classroom performances can be an effective tool for improving teaching skills. Faculty development programs can also be very effective. Boice (1984) noted that faculty members

involved in a teaching skills program had a decrease in classroom discomfort and showed substantial improvements in their overall presentation. He feels that "the findings demonstrate that faculty development programs can incorporate both teaching and scholarship without mutual interference" (p. 200).

Tenure

In the area of tenure versus contracts, the literature shows there are substantially more institutions of higher educations which have a traditional system rather than the contract system. Mortimer and others (1985) surveyed four-year colleges and universities and found only about 6% of the respondents had no tenure system. Most of them were private institutions and were small, liberal arts colleges. At most institutions of higher education where the contract system is used, tenured faculty have three year contracts and are reviewed annually. If the review is negative, then the faculty member must undergo additional evaluations and followup.

Tenure evaluation is generally outlined in the faculty handbook as a combination of teaching, research, and community service. However, many professors feel they are judged too harshly when it comes to research productivity. In opposition to this point, Gonzalez (1986) admits she "is astonished when she encounters the argument, even among academics themselves, that research is overemphasized in tenure decisions" (p. 9). She feels that research activities are a must, even for tenured faculty, for this work keeps one aware of new developments in his or her field and refines critical thinking and judgment skills.

Methodology

Instrument

The self-designed survey instrument contained 15 Likert-type items with possible responses ranging from very high (5) to very low (1). A second section contained 6 items with a response set of yes, no, or no comment. An open-ended response section and

several demographic questions were also included in the instrument.

The faculty members were asked their opinions on several issues related to the topic of evaluation and reward including tenure, renewable contracts, and alternative evaluation methods. Faculty members were also asked about the level of priority both they and the administration assign to the areas of research, classroom teaching, and community service and also about the appropriateness of these areas as a basis for evaluation.

Subjects

Surveys were mailed to 230 randomly selected faculty members, and 113 responses were received. Of those faculty members responding, 29.0% were female and 71.0% were male. Ages ranged from 27 to 69, and median age was 44. Master's degrees were held by 25.2% of the faculty members, and 73.9% possessed doctoral degrees. The respondents included 52.7% tenured faculty members and 47.3% non-tenured. The median of years of higher education experience was 14.5.

Data Analysis

The chi-square test for independence was used to test if the proportion of responses to each of the survey items was the same based on sex, age, degree, tenure status, and years of teaching in higher education. Faculty members were divided into two age groups for analysis -- under 45 and 45 and over. Years of teaching in higher education was divided into three categories--1 to 10, 11 to 20, and 21 plus. Response categories for the first section were collapsed into high, moderate, and low. Only yes and no responses were used from the second section. The chi-square tests were performed at the .05 level of significance.

Only significant differences will be reported due to the large number of analyses performed. Summary percentages were also calculated for each item and are reported on Table 1. Some comments from the open-ended response section were summarized, and selected responses are highlighted on Table 2.

Results

Sex

There was a significant difference ($X^2 = 7.96$, $p = .019$) between male and female faculty members on the use of research and publication as a method for annual evaluation. While 63.5% of the males rated this method of evaluation highly, only 33.3% of the females assigned it a high rating. The majority of females (46.7%) had only a moderate opinion about being evaluated based on accomplished research and publications.

When asked to rate a university-sponsored personal development program designed to improve teaching style, 80.6% of the females and 51.3% of the males rated it highly. There was a significant difference ($X^2 = 7.91$, $p = .019$) in their proportion of responses to this item. Similarly, there was a significant difference ($X^2 = 5.17$, $p = .023$) between male and female faculty members on the idea of incorporating the personal development program into an evaluation instrument of teaching style. More females (76.9%) responded positively to this idea than males (47.3%).

Age

The general opinion about having video tapes of teaching style evaluated by speech professional was low. However, there was a significant difference ($X^2 = 8.27$, $p = .016$) between those faculty members under age 45 and those age 45 and over. Fifty percent of the younger group had a low opinion about this type of evaluation and 75.5% of the older group gave this idea a low rating.

Younger and older faculty members also felt significantly different ($X^2 = 7.91$, $p = .019$) about having a university-sponsored personal development program to improve teaching style. More of the young faculty members (71.0%) were interested in this type of program than were older faculty members (47.1%). Similarly, there was a significant difference ($X^2 = 5.30$, $p = .021$) between the two age groups on the idea of actually incorporating the personal development program into the present evaluation system. More of the younger (68.1%) than older (40.5%) faculty members responded positively to this idea.

Degree

There was a significant difference ($X^2 = 22.85$, $p < .001$) in level of priority assigned to research based on the type of degree held. When asked to rate the level of priority personally given to research, (25.0%) of those with only a master's degree assigned it a high priority. The majority of a master's degree only responses were divided almost equally between moderate (39.3%) and low (35.7%) priorities while a majority of those possessing doctoral degrees (73.2%) assigned a high level of priority to research.

There was also a significant difference ($X^2 = 9.04$, $p = .011$) based on type of degree held in responses to the following item: "What level of priority, in your opinion, does the administration give classroom teaching?" A majority of master's degree only faculty members (64.3%) felt that the administration assigns classroom teaching a low priority. Those possessing doctoral degrees were divided in their opinions (37.8% - low, 34.1% - moderate, and 28.0% - high) about this question.

When asked to give an opinion about research and publications as an aspect of annual evaluation, only 19.2% of those with a master's degree rated it highly. However, a majority of those with a doctoral degree (66.7%) rated this method of evaluation highly. Most of the master's degree only faculty members (53.8%) rated this method moderately. Responses to this question were significantly different ($X^2 = 18.89$, $p < .001$) based on type of degree held.

There was a significant difference ($X^2 = 6.27$, $p = .012$) based on degree type on the question of whether or not a system of renewable contracts (as an alternative to tenure) would cause a loss of academic freedom. More of those with a doctoral degree (72.4%) responded that this system would negatively affect academic freedom than those with only a master's degree (41.7%).

There was a significant difference based on degree held on each of the following questions:

(1) Can faculty members remain current in their discipline without a major focus on research activities? ($X^2 = 5.83$, $p = .016$)

(2) Does research interfere with classroom teaching? ($X^2 = 9.84$, $p = .002$)

(3) Do you feel the growing emphasis on research and publication diminishes the quality of instruction? ($X^2 = 5.15$, $p = .023$)

More master's degree faculty members (80.8%) than doctoral degree faculty members (51.3%) felt that one could remain current in his or her discipline without a major focus on research activities. In fact, 91.7% of those master's degree faculty members stated that research interferes with classroom teaching opposed to only 53.3% of those with doctoral degrees. This trend continued as 84.0% of those at a master's degree level responded that the emphasis on research and publication diminishes the quality of instruction. Of those with a terminal degree 56.3% felt that quality of instruction was lessened by emphasis on research activities.

Status

When asked what level of priority the administration assigned to classroom teaching, tenured and non-tenured faculty members responded significantly different ($X^2 = 12.32$, $p = .002$) from one another. A majority of the tenured faculty members (61.4%) felt that the administration assigns a very low priority to classroom teaching. However, non-tenured faculty members were almost evenly divided on the priority levels.

Tenured and non-tenured faculty members were significantly different ($X^2 = 13.72$, $p = .001$) on their opinions about the inclusion of video tapes of classroom performance in the evaluation system. More tenured faculty members (76.8%) disliked this innovation than did non-tenured professors (42.3%). Only 10.7% of those with tenure rated this feature highly as opposed to 32.7% of those without tenure.

The idea of a university-sponsored personal development program designed to improve teaching style appealed to both tenured and non-tenured faculty members; however, their distribution of responses was significantly different ($X^2 = 9.65$, $p = .008$). A majority of the non-tenured faculty members (75.0%) approved of this system while 46.6% of the tenured faculty members rated it highly and 31.0% rated it moderately. Only 15.5% of the total respondents had a low opinion about this type of program. However, when asked if a personal development program should be incorporated into the present evaluation system of faculty, only 40.5% of the tenured professors agreed. A majority of non-tenured faculty (71.4%) would approve the inclusion of such a program as part of the evaluation procedure.

Years Teaching in Higher Education

The only significant difference ($X^2 = 8.66$, $p = .013$) based on numbers of years of teaching in higher education was on the question of whether or not a personal development program should be incorporated into an evaluation instrument of teaching style for tenured faculty. Responses indicated that the longer the faculty member had been teaching in higher education, the more negative he or she was about the inclusion of this type of program as part of the evaluation system. A majority of those faculty (72.2%) who had been teaching 10 or less years in higher education expressed approval regarding the use of this type of program as an evaluation tool. About half of the faculty members (51.7%) with 11 to 20 years teaching experience in higher education responded positively, but only 31.6% of those with 21 or more years of experience approved of this innovation.

Open-ended Responses

Approximately one-half (53%) of the respondents wrote comments in the open-ended response section. Some faculty members spoke of the need for clarification of particular items. Others just took advantage of the opportunity to "blow off steam" about the

university administration. However, a majority of the comments were concerned with the issue of research and teaching. Faculty members seemed genuinely concerned over the conflict between quality of instruction and research productivity. Samples of their comments are highlighted on Table 2.

Conclusion

The research does not mention specific empirical studies on the morale of faculty, however Salomone and Vorhies (1985) write "evaluation (exclusively by administrators) had contributed to a decline in faculty morale and a growing disillusionment with the profession of teaching." The responses to the question on personal morale in the survey were spread rather evenly over the scale with 71.2% responding moderate or above; however 24.8% responded low or very low.

Over 50% of the respondents have a positive opinion about research and publication as a method of evaluation, while 84.5% feel positive about classroom teaching as a method of evaluation. This is supported by Creswell (1986), Donald (1984), and Dixon and Yarbrough (1986).

The male faculty members gave their approval of research and publication as a method of annual evaluation, while only one-third of the females felt strongly about this subject. A high percentage (73.2%) of those with doctoral degrees gave a high priority to research, while those with master's degrees gave low and moderate responses to research.

The faculty feel they can remain current in their discipline without a major focus on research. Webster's (1985) work on the relationship between research and classroom teaching cites eleven empirical studies; none of the studies can find a significant relationship between research and classroom teaching. The faculty feels strongly that research interferes with classroom teaching,

and they feel very strongly that the growing emphasis on research diminishes classroom teaching.

The item concerning the university-sponsored personal development program to improve teaching had more significant differences among the respondents than any of the other general areas addressed by the survey. Males and females had positive reactions, the under 45 year-old faculty members responded in favor of the system, those without tenure had very high positive responses and those who have been teaching in higher education less than ten years had a positive opinion about the development program. The females, the younger faculty and the non-tenured members support the inclusion of a personal development program (and apparently the improvement of teaching) into the annual evaluation. However, a majority of the faculty, contrary to the positive data by Tribe and Fletcher (1984), Perlberg (1983) and Boice (1984), reject the use of video tapes for evaluation.

"Not all of one's professors can be expected to produce great and lasting work, but so long as they produce *something*, their students will understand a bit more of what it means to be creative." (Gonzalez, 1986, p. 10) I believe Gonzalez sums up the view of the administrations in the the "transitional college" (Greswell's words): publish so the students will have a better education. Unfortunately, a vast majority of the students do not read the academic works of their professors, nor could they readily understand the work since it is quite often in the vernacular.

Kasten (1984) reminds the reader the vast sums of money which keep the university doors open are based on students not research productivity.

The respondents to this survey clearly felt there is too much emphasis on publication (although they still support it as an annual evaluation tool). They are also very interested in a university-sponsored personal development program to improve teaching therefore expressing the view that teaching is very important.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES FOR SURVEY ITEMS

	Very Low	Low	Mod	High	Very High
1. How would you best describe your personal morale in your present faculty position?	8.0	16.8	27.4	27.4	20.4
2. What level of priority do you give classroom teaching?	0.0	0.0	4.4	40.7	54.9
3. What level of priority do you give research?	2.7	11.5	24.8	35.4	25.7
4. What level of priority do you give community service?	6.2	23.0	33.6	30.1	7.1
5. What level of priority, in your opinion, does the administration give classroom teaching?	23.2	22.3	33.0	15.2	6.3
6. What level of priority, in your opinion, does the administration give research?	0.9	2.7	8.0	26.8	61.6
7. What level of priority, in your opinion, does the administration give community service?	19.5	39.8	29.2	8.8	2.7
8. What is your opinion about community service as a method for annual evaluation?	16.5	25.7	36.7	14.7	6.4
9. What is your opinion about research and publication as a method for annual evaluation?	4.5	7.3	31.8	40.0	16.4
10. What is your opinion about classroom teaching as a method for annual evaluation?	0.0	0.0	15.5	43.6	40.9
11. How do you rate the current tenure system?	15.2	21.4	48.2	13.4	1.8
12. How would you rate an employment system based on a series of renewable contracts?	19.3	24.8	29.4	22.0	4.6

	Very Low	Low	Mod	High	Very High
13. How would you rate an evaluation system where video tapes are evaluated by speech professionals to provide feedback on teaching style?	32.4	28.8	18.0	15.3	5.4
14. How would you rate annual evaluation criteria individually designed by mutual agreement between the individual faculty and the administration?	7.1	10.7	25.0	42.0	15.2
15. How would you rate a university-sponsored personal development program to improve teaching style?	9.7	5.3	24.8	42.5	17.7

	Yes	No	No Comment
16. Should a personal development program be incorporated into an evaluation instrument of the teaching style of tenured faculty?	42.7	33.6	23.6
17. In your opinion, would a system of renewable contracts, as alternative to tenure, cause a loss of academic freedom?	59.8	31.3	8.9
18. Is community service non-paid work outside the university?	63.9	25.0	11.1
19. Can faculty remain current in their discipline without a major focus on research activities?	55.4	40.2	4.5
20. Does research interfere with classroom teaching?	59.3	34.3	6.5
21. Do you feel the growing emphasis on research and publication diminishes the quality of instruction?	62.2	35.1	2.7

TABLE 2

SURVEY COMMENTS REGARDING RESEARCH AND TEACHING

"It has been both my experience as a researcher and observing others that research can dominate one's thoughts and perceptions causing an unrealistic and unhealthy emphasis rather than effecting balance in teaching."

"The growing emphasis on research aids classroom teaching by keeping teachers fresh and vibrant."

"It is always easier for administrators to count articles and papers rather than evaluate good teaching. They justify the position by equating good teaching and research. Good teachers may or may not be good researchers and the reverse is also true."

"A faculty member can stay current by reading and studying journals and the results of a wide range of current research--and another faculty member can get very out of touch while actively engaged in research in a narrow area. A healthy balance is required."

"When an instructor is expected to teach a full load and take on research at the same time, the quality of instruction definitely diminishes."

"I have always thought research should be second to teaching. We are here for the students."

"Research and teaching go hand-in-hand. The administration simply needs to provide more resources to support the research effort."

"Good teaching is not adequately rewarded. Faculty who do not demonstrate a certain quality of research are discounted regardless of their teaching skill."

"The notion that tenure is impossible without research and publication minimizes the importance of teaching."

"Some are better qualified for and more interested in research. The end result is that poor teachers are frequently rewarded, and excellent teachers are harassed and made to feel guilty and often fired. It's like firing a center fielder because he can't pitch."

"I think those who are best suited for research should be encouraged to do so. Those best suited for teaching should be allowed to do so. Neither should be coerced into doing both poorly."

"A responsible faculty member makes an appropriate balance between teaching and research. A responsible administration provides the environment for such a balance."

"A certain percentage of the faculty could be hired to produce research and publications, where others would concentrate on teaching and community service. The university needs <u>both</u> to survive."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boice, Robert. *Reexamination of traditional emphasis in faculty development*, Research in Higher Education Vol. 21, 1984, pp. 195-201.

Creswell, J. W. *Observing, promoting, evaluating and reviewing research performance*, New Directions in Institutional Research, Vol. 13, June, 1986, pp. 87-91.

DeYoung, Alan J. *Assessing "Faculty Production": penetration of the technical thesis into the status system of academe*, Educational Theory, Vol. 35, Fall, 1985, pp. 411-421.

Dill, David. *Research as a scholarly activity: context and culture*, New Directions in Institutional Research, Vol. 13, June, 1986, pp. 7-17.

Dixon, Paul N. and Yarbrough, Douglas W. *Student evaluations of faculty: do they accurately portray teaching effectiveness?*, Texas Tech Journal of Education, Vol. 13, Winter, 1986, pp. 29-34.

Donald, Janet G. *Quality indices for faculty evaluation*, Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, Vol. 9, Spring, 1984, pp. 41-52.

Florestano, Patricia and Hambrick, Ralph. *Rewarding faculty members for profession-related public service*, Educational Record, Vol. 65, Winter, 1984, pp. 18-21.

Gonzalez, Nancie L. *The professor as researcher*, National Forum Vol. 67, Winter, 1987, pp. 7-10.

Kasten, Katherine Lewellan. *Tenure and merit pay as rewards of research, teaching and service at a research university*, Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 55, July/August, 1984, pp. 500-513.

Mortimer, K. P., and others. Flexibility in Academic Staffing, Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D. C., 1985, pp. 20-27.

Perlberg, A. *When professors confront themselves: towards a theoretical conceptualization of video self-confrontation in higher education*, Higher Education, Vol. 12, 1983, pp. 633-663.